

Chrono

EXECUTIVE SECRETARIAT
ROUTING SLIP

TO:

Rec'd 18 June 84

		ACTION	INFO	DATE	INITIAL
1	DCI		X w/o att		
2	DDCI		X w/att		
3	EXDIR		X w/o att		
4	D/ICS				
5	DDI	X w/att			
6	DDA				
7	DDO				
8	DDS&T				
9	Chm/NIC				
10	GC				
11	IG				
12	Compt				
13	D/Pers				
14	D/OLL				
15	D/PAO				
16	SA/IA				
17	AO/DCI				
18	C/IPD/OIS				
19					
20					
21					
22					
SUSPENSE		Date _____			

Remarks

18 June 84
Date

TOP SECRET

UNCLASSIFIED when blank - TOP SECRET when attached to Top Secret Document - Automatically downgraded or declassified when filled in form is detached from the controlled document.

CONTROL AND COVER SHEET FOR TOP SECRET DOCUMENT (COLLATERAL)

CIA T.S. CONTROL NUMBER		CIA COPY NUMBER		DOCUMENT DATE	DATE RECEIVED
TS 840133		2		18 June 1984	18 June 1984
NO. PAGES	NO. OF ATTACHMENTS (CIA T.S. # of Attachment)		BRANCH, BADGE #, OR LOCATION		LOGGED BY
1	None		DCI		TSCO/ER
SUBJECT:					
Population Policies (U)					
CIA SOURCE INFORMATION ORIGINATOR			EXTERNAL SOURCE INFORMATION ORIGINATOR		
DIRECTORATE	OFFICE/BRANCH		AGENCY	CONTROL NUMBER	COPY NO.
DCI	O/DCI				

ATTENTION: This form will be placed on top of and attached to each Top Secret document received by the Central Intelligence Agency or classified Top Secret within the CIA and will remain attached to the document until such time as it is downgraded, destroyed, or transmitted outside of CIA. Access to Top Secret matter is limited to Top Secret Control personnel and those individuals whose official duties relate to the matter. Top Secret Control Officers who receive and/or release the attached Top Secret material will sign this form and indicate period of custody in the left-hand columns provided. Each individual who sees the Top Secret document will sign and indicate the date of handling in the right-hand columns.

REFERRED TO OFFICE	RECEIVED			RELEASED		SEEN BY		
	SIGNATURE	DATE	TIME	DATE	TIME	SIGNATURE	OFFICE/DIV.	DATE
DCI								

When this form is detached from Top Secret material it shall be completed in the appropriate spaces below and forwarded to the Agency Top Secret Control Office.

DOWNGRADED		DESTROYED		DISPATCHED (Outside CIA)	
TO		BY (Signature)		TO	
BY (Signature)		WITNESSED BY (Signature)		BY (Signature)	
DIRECTORATE & AREA OFFICE		DIRECTORATE & AREA OFFICE		DIRECTORATE & AREA OFFICE	
DATE		DATE		DATE	

TOP SECRETDCI
EXEC
REG
(40)

18 June 1984

MEMORANDUM FOR: Deputy Director of Central Intelligence
Deputy Director for Intelligence

FROM: Director of Central Intelligence

SUBJECT: Population Policies

Noting the attached story on the first page of today's Times about the White House-State Department dispute on aid to population control programs, it seems to me that [] proposed article, "LDCs: Consequences of Rapid Population Growth" would appear to be an inappropriate intervention into policy dispute. This particularly so because the feud is one of long standing and the basic facts of population growth and potential economic impact are well and widely recognized and there is no fresh intelligence []

25X1

25X1


William J. Casey

Attachments:

Clipping from The New York Times
Clipping from The Washington Post
Article, "LDCs: Consequences of
Rapid Population Growth"

TS 840133

Copy 2

25X1

The New York Times, Monday, 18 June 1984

Aides Assert Reagan Is Determined to End Aid Tied to Abortion

By PHIL GAILEY

Special to The New York Times

WASHINGTON, June 17 — President Reagan is determined to change United States policy to eliminate aid to international population control programs that practice or advocate abortion, White House officials said today.

The proposal, outlined in a draft paper being circulated within the Administration, comes when many developing countries are intensifying family planning efforts to ease social and economic stress.

Some of President Reagan's aides say the proposal is partly motivated by election-year politics, but they also say it is aimed strictly at abortion and not other family planning measures.

The United States, according to staff members of the Population Crisis Committee, contributes \$240 million annually to international population control programs, about half of the total international expenditure in this area. They estimate that the proposal, if approved by President Reagan and converted into new regulations, would cost these programs \$100 million in United States assistance.

Specifically, the staff members say, the new policy would eliminate aid to

the United Nations Fund for Population Activities and to a number of private organizations.

The eight-page draft paper, which the National Security Council sent out May 30 for review by Government agencies, is the working draft of a statement that the United States is preparing for delivery at a United Nations Conference on Population in Mexico City scheduled for August. Former Senator James L. Buckley of New York, who shares President Reagan's opposition to abortion, has been asked by the White House to deliver the paper at the conference.

A high-level White House official said today that the draft statement is likely to be revised, but he added that "the final statement will reflect this Administration's feelings on population control."

The proposal, which has come under attack from some members of Congress and population control groups who see it as a reversal of a long-standing policy, blames "governmental control of economies" in developing countries and "anti-intellectualism" in the Western world for the problems associated with overpopulation. It also says that population growth could be an economic asset in some countries if "oppressive economic policies" were replaced by a free-market system.

"The United Nations Declaration of the Rights of the Child (1959) calls for legal protection for children before as well as after birth," the draft document says, "and the United States accordingly does not consider abortion an acceptable element of family planning programs and will not contribute to those of which it is a part.

"Nor will it any longer contribute directly or indirectly to family planning programs funded by governments or private organizations that advocate abortion as an instrument of population control."

Existing rules ban the use of American funds to pay for abortions by governments and private organizations. Under the new policy, even programs that use private donations or money from other governments to pay for abortions would lose United States assistance.

Congressional approval is not needed for the policy change. Once President Reagan formally approves the new policy, the State Department and other agencies would have to revise their rules to reflect the change.

Congress could block the policy revision by passing specific legislation, but given its reluctance to have another debate on abortion in an election year, it does not appear likely to do so.

Baker a Driving Force

The high-level White House official said James A. Baker 3d, the White House chief of staff, was a major force behind the proposed policy change. For too long, this official said, the State Department and other Government agencies had followed the views of the population control lobby and, he added, Mr. Baker had decided "there was need to get a handle on it."

The official said President Reagan could suffer "political damage" if official policy was out of line with his personal views on abortion, or, worse, if it appeared that "he wasn't in control."

He added: "The policy statement was a means of asserting White House policy control over this. That's what Baker felt was important."

The Washington Post (date unknown)

Rowland Evans and Robert Novak

The Population Policy Battle

A White House position paper putting the United States on record that big government, not big families, causes Third World poverty is under furious assault by the population control lobby.

On May 30, the National Security Council staff forwarded for intragovernmental review a remarkable "draft statement" of U.S. policy for the International Population Conference in Mexico City Aug. 6-13. Departing from past policy, it contends the United States "does not consider abortion an acceptable element of family planning programs and will not contribute to those of which it is part." Nor will this country "any longer" help finance foreign programs "that advocate abortion as an instrument of population control."

A copy was promptly leaked by outraged State Department officials to the population control lobby. Two former senators deeply involved in that movement—Republican Robert Taft Jr. and Democrat Joseph Tydings—sent a passionate letter to members of Congress June 6. Assailing the White House paper for a "fundamentalist, know-nothing" political philosophy," they charged that it "subverts the congressional prerogatives for setting policy."

Thus, when President Reagan returned from Europe, he found an establishment-populist debate of the kind his political advisers would rather avoid. To bow to establishment pressure by ditching the draft paper would estrange anti-abortion supporters—Protestant fundamentalists and Catholic blue-collar families he needs Nov. 6.

The "pro-lifers" have wanted one of their own heading the delegation to Mexico City. In response, the White House recently informed them it would be headed by a distinguished Catholic layman and abortion hater, former senator James Buckley.

But Richard E. Benedick, the State Department's coordinator of population affairs and a career Foreign Service officer renowned for pressing population control, quickly assembled a delegation to surround if not smother Buckley. His recommendations include not only such pro-control Republicans as Taft and Rep. John Porter of Illinois but two anti-Reagan liberal Democrats, Reps. James Scheuer of New York and Sander Levin of Michigan.

What Benedick had not expected, however, was the draft study prepared by the White House policy development office in coordination with the NSC staff. It would opt for people, not

governments, as the real creators of wealth. Population has become a problem, it said, because of "governmental control of economies, a pathology of which spread throughout the developing world with sufficient virulence to keep much of it from developing further."

That is not the end of the paper's heresies: "Population control is not a panacea. It will not solve problems of massive unemployment." Rather, it suggests "population density" may actually help economic development, adding "that as long as oppressive economic policies penalize those who work, save and invest, joblessness will persist."

Counterattacking, Taft and Tydings wrote members of Congress warning of "a potential foreign policy embarrassment of serious proportions." Noting that the last eight administrations have followed population control policies, it asserted: "No administration—Democrat or Republican—should change that policy unilaterally."

Specifically, the two former senators protested a ban on U.S. aid to governments or private organizations "that also happen to provide financial support for abortion services." They were conceding for the first time that financing abortion goes with U.S.-funded population programs.

Taft and Tydings attached to their letter a Senate Foreign Relations Committee report on the unpassed foreign aid bill as the congressional imprimatur. The U.S. position in Mexico City, said the committee report, "should be in full accord with policies which have been established by the committee and by Congress in cooperation with successive administrations."

That displayed the population lobby's clout. The committee report's words were lifted directly from a sample letter Taft has been urging congressmen to send Secretary of State George Shultz (and was indeed sent him verbatim by the Foreign Relations chairman, Sen. Charles Percy, and the Appropriations chairman, Sen. Mark Hatfield).

The day after he received his Tydings-Taft S.O.S., Porter dutifully took the House floor urging the administration to reject the draft report. But the president will do so at the risk of alienating his core constituency. Jim Buckley would be unlikely to accept his mission to Mexico City unless the Reagan administration opts for economic incentives, not human restraints as the route to wealth for poor nations.

©1984, News Group Chicago, Inc.

Page Denied